

## The Progressive Farmer.

L. L. POLK, - - - EDITOR.  
J. L. RAMSEY, - - ASSOCIATE EDITOR.  
W. F. DALY, - - - BUSINESS MANAGER.

Raleigh, N. C.

## -SUBSCRIPTION:-

Sing. Subscriber, One Year, \$1.25  
" " Six Months, .75  
Five Subscribers, One Year, 5.00  
Ten " " " " " " 10.00  
One copy one year free, to the one sending Club of Ten.

Cash-Invariably in Advance.

Money at our risk, if sent by registered letter or money order.

Advertising Rates quoted on application.

To Correspondents:

Write all communications, designed for publication, on one side of the paper only. We want intelligent correspondents in every county in the State. We want facts of value, results accomplished of value, experience of value, plainly and briefly told. One solid, demonstrated fact, is worth a thousand theories. Address all communications to THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER, Raleigh, N. C.

R. LEIGH, N. C., JULY 15 1890

[This paper entered as second-class matter at the Post Office in Raleigh, N. C.]

The Progressive Farmer is the Official Organ of the N. C. Farmers' Association and N. C. State Farmers' Alliance.

Do you want your paper changed to another office? State the one at which you have been getting it.

Do you want your communication published? If so, give us your real name and your postoffice.

Our friends in writing to any of our advertisers, will favor us by mentioning the fact that they saw the advertisement in THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER.

The date on your label tells you when your time is out.

## A SMALL FAVOR ASKED.

Will the judges, members of the State Senate and members of the Lower House who have refused to accept free passes from the different railroad corporations in the State be so kind as to drop us a postal card to that effect? We would appreciate this little act of kindness very much.

In response to the above the following members of the Legislature and Senate have gone on record as having refused railroad passes:

B. A. Wellons, Johnston county; J. D. Parker, Perquimans county; E. C. Beddingfield, Wake county; M. J. Ham, Wayne county; John Norwood, Orange county; N. Gibbon, Mecklenburg county.

## SENATOR VANCE AND OUR CRITICS.

OUR editorial in regard to the disposition of the Sub-Treasury bill by Senator Vance seems to have created quite a stir. We expressed our feelings on the matter and had not thought of saying much more about it unless there should be new developments. However, so much has been said both pro and con and our language having been misunderstood in some respects, we misinterpret due all concerned to explain several things and publish additional literature bearing directly upon the subject, which, we think, will strengthen our original position and at the same time do justice to all parties.

We will begin by asking a question and giving the answer. Who has a right to criticize the mistakes or wrong doings either of private citizens or of public officials, and who, if they should go too far in the matter and do them some injustice, would be so likely to reconsider the matter and right the wrong done?

Undoubtedly it is his friends. Is THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER a friend of Senator Vance? Col. L. L. Polk is the editor and owner of this paper. His record shows that he is. We have never even heard it intimated that he has ever antagonized Senator Vance in this State or elsewhere. On the other hand many will testify as to his warm friendship for Senator Vance. During the past six months Col. Polk has made flying visits to Raleigh several times. In several private and confidential conversations with the writer he has discussed Senator Vance and his connection with the Sub-Treasury bill. He always spoke of Senator Vance in a way that was proof positive that he had great confidence in the Senator. The fact that Col. Polk is in the North-western States filling his appointments is well known and the writer authorized the statement in the *Daily Chronicle* of the 11th to the effect that Col. Polk knew nothing of the nature of the editorials or other matter in his paper at this time, but that the associate editor, whose name can be seen at the top of this paper at all times, was alone responsible for all that the paper contains, the views of correspondents and clippings from other papers, of course, always excepted. When the editorial was written Col. Polk did not know of the action of Senator Vance nor the existence of his letter. Hence he could not have written the editorial nor could he have dictated it. We dwell on this point because we want the public to know who to censure if anything appears in this paper that is not right during his absence there.

Well, what about the associate editor? He has always been a Democrat—was raised "up in the faith,"

As such has been one of Senator Vance's admirers and supporters, and expect to be if Vance does right. The writer has carried torches and rode in horseback processions in honor of Vance, even before he was old enough to vote. In fact the writer has "hollored" himself hoarse and has been as big a fool about Senator Vance as any of the average citizens in the State.

So far as we have heard, our farmer friends generally approve of the editorial in last week's paper. They all say that they think Senator Vance has done wrong—made a mistake, and that the criticism was called for. Some few think it was rather harsh.

The truth is, there is always two sides to a question, and generally there are palliating circumstances attending things which we too often overlook in our haste to commend a thing we think is right, or condemn what we think is wrong. THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER is an Alliance paper. It is not run in the interest of Senator Vance, nor of the Democratic party, nor the Republican party. However, it has given Senator Vance more advertising in its columns during the past six months than any paper in the State. The name of Vance has appeared in its columns oftener, editorially, or in communications, and having more than twice as great a circulation in the State as that of any other paper, and all this being praise of him partly on account of his supposed advocacy of and willingness to push the Sub-Treasury bill, or a good substitute, and partly because of the great confidence of our correspondents and ourselves in him as a man. After all of this you are bound to admit that we think we have good reasons for even severe criticisms.

If you ask the reasons, here are some of them: Is Senator Vance a King? In "ye olden time" there was a belief that the King could do no wrong, or something of the kind. If you thought he did, you were not allowed to say so. But we live in a free country. Everybody can do and say what he thinks, to a certain extent, and as the Irishman said: "Bejabbers the man who will not do as he pleases in this free country ought to be compelled to do so."

If the writer has done Senator Vance an injustice, all have failed to produce the proof. They put forward his record as a public official and defend that. We have done the same before to day and volunteer to do so again if necessary. We did not attack his past record, and will say right here that if that record had not been above reproach, we would have hit him a great deal harder for the present offense.

Now a few words about the wrong done. Senator Vance says he told Col. Polk and Dr. Macne that, in his opinion, the Sub-Treasury bill was unconstitutional when first presented to him. That was all right. But we will say here that Senator Vance was never a great success as a lawyer. He was popular as a lawyer, as stump speaker and as a man; but never was considered a great lawyer. So he may be mistaken about the constitutionality of the bill. Aside from his popularity wherever known, we have never heard that Senator Vance has exhibited extraordinary ability in anything except as a tariff debater. Along that line he probably is the equal of any man in America. We repeat that he is liable to be mistaken as to constitutionality. The *Economist* says that the Legislative Committee of the Alliance give Senator Vance authority to change the bill so that it would be constitutional, and says further that he did change it. Senator Vance's duty was to get the bill in as good shape as possible and to have watched its course, suggested changes, offered amendments and the committee in each house should have done so, too. Neither Senator Vance nor the members of the committee decide the constitutionality of anything. The Senate as a body itself cannot decide constitutional questions. The Supreme Court makes a specialty of that.

In our editorial we said in substance that if the Sub-Treasury bill was not constitutional, Senator Vance should have continued to work for it, as he is paid to do, until the farmers said stop; we will abandon this bill. We stand on the same immovable platform. We are now going to take Senator Vance's own words in support of this. In the Washington news published in the *State Chronicle* on last Friday, we find that Senator Vance has changed over to our side. The silver bill was under discussion in the Senate. Mr. Plumb said: "That in the particulars which he regarded as essential the bill was comparatively unobjectionable, supposing always that a compromise had to be made."

In reply to the above Senator Vance used the following language: "It is admitted that the bill is not what it ought to be. Common sense would dictate then that we try to make it what it ought to be."

Ah! there, dear Senator Vance. We have got you where the wool is long enough to hold you awhile at least. You do not hesitate to say that your duty and that of your fellow member is to hold on and make the silver bill what it ought to be. You evidently are favor of the passage of the bill. Why did you not say the

same about the Sub-Treasury? Why didn't you say, "boys the Sub-Treasury bill is not what it ought to be, but common sense would dictate that we try to make it what it ought to be. Go it boys, it may not be constitutional, but we can make it constitutional. My farmer friends down in North Carolina are nearly all in favor of it, so are the farmers of other States." He should have said all of this, and a great deal more, and he should have continued to talk it in unmistakable language. Senator Vance may be the biggest man in North Carolina; he may be the smartest; he may be the noblest, but we have used his own argument—his own words, against his own logic in the Sub-Treasury matter, and we defy Senator Vance or any other of the "biggest" men in North Carolina to successfully controvert the position.

Now we are going to quote the following from his letter to President Carr:

"My own position remains the same. I cannot support this bill in its present shape. But I am not opposed to the principle and purposes of the measure. On the contrary they are those which I have for ten years advocated, and for the accomplishment of which I have in every county in North Carolina again and again urged the organization of the farmers, pointing out to them how that all other classes of society were organized for the promotion of their separate interests."

Now, the biggest man in North Carolina has put his foot in it again. The principles of the Sub-Treasury bill are all right. "They are those which I have for ten years advocated." The principles of the silver bill are all right, too, but the bill is crude. "But common sense would dictate then that we try to make it what it ought to be." We think the most ardent friends of our "junior senator" will agree with us after a careful reading of the above facts that he has placed himself in another awkward position.

The principles of the Sub-Treasury plan are all right. He "has been advocating them for ten years." If the principles of a man are good he is safe. He may make great mistakes. But if his principles are good there is hope that something may be done. If the principles of a bill are wrong it being an inanimate thing, it cannot change. But when they are right, as he admits, we have Senator Vance and 416 other well paid legislators in Washington City, whose business it is to try to put them in first-class shape. Senator Vance says he cannot honestly support a measure that he thinks is unconstitutional. There is another palliating circumstance for our course in this. This is not the first time laws for the relief of farmers have been discarded. The farmers have about come to the conclusion that everything they want is disposed of with that stereotyped word—"Unconstitutional."

Now, why is this? The farmers as a mass are generally very unselfish. They will take one half if they can't get a whole thing. The Constitution of the United States is the most reasonable thing in the world. It could hardly be improved. It grants freedom and liberty to all and equal rights to all. Why is it that the most reasonable class of people living under that Constitution have failed year after year in getting what little they have asked for and after having made all manner of concessions, have been met with that wonderful, wonderful word—"unconstitutional." All professional and business men agree that the farmers' prosperity is their prosperity. That is true. Then if the farmers should get a little class legislation would not everybody be benefited to some degree. Our opinion is, and many things point that way, that many of our law-makers and their associates have decided that the farmers and other laboring people must be kept down—must be kept ignorant; must be held in subjection or they will feel their power and overthrow their schemes to enrich themselves and build palaces and wear fine linen every day. That is our opinion. God alone can answer this correctly.

Now as to Senator Vance's opinion of the Sub-Treasury bill may be right. His opinion or yours, dear reader, is only that of one man. It is not a matter of opinion. A large portion of our people have said they wanted the bill or a better one passed. They must have relief. Senator Vance refuses to push the measure, and after all our trouble he throws it aside and writes a letter and advises us to fight for relief inside the party ranks; to fight for tariff reduction and all that. His advice is good if there was a possibility to carry it out. We must continue to fight as he advises on that. But in throwing down the Sub-Treasury bill he puts us back where we started, back to issues that have been kept alive for years without result. He discards the Sub-Treasury bill which if passed would have taken our farmers out of the hands of the stock and grain speculators and enabled them to have held their produce some little time so they could have disposed of it at much greater advantage. Where one county could not have been entitled to a warehouse it could have been built on county lines and two or three counties could have got advantage of the

system. The bill might have been made constitutional. The opinions of Senator Vance and the constitution does not feed people. It does not lift the mortgages from our farms and homes; it does not give bread and money to widows and orphans. When the children of this day are growing up in ignorance for want of money Senator Vance's opinions will not pay for their education. No, it is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of so much importance that the existence of this government hangs as by a tiny thread which the Sub-Treasury bill might have strengthened until the thread became a rope.

Those who blame THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER for its utterances must remember that it has opinions and does not go over the country to see what other people say about anything. It says what it thinks, but is willing at all times to acknowledge an error if the proof is put forward.

The press generally has been very sensible and conservative in their criticism of our editorial. But a few have made some wild remarks, but we accord them the right to express their opinions. Our neighbor, the *State Chronicle*, got sick last week. It was very sick. We fear that in his zeal to apologize for our distinguished Senator, Bro. Daniels went further than was necessary. It takes up the paragraph, "The moral of all is: We must go back to the old way of electing farmer Congressmen and Senators. It becomes more and more apparent that those we call our friends are our enemies."

We had explained and modified that paragraph in a conversation with Bro. Daniels. Every editor in this country knows that it is hard to write just what you want to write at times and to get it just where it ought to have been. We will not apologize for the sentiment contained in that paragraph. We have written about the same before—expect to again. We meant to say about this although the language conveys a different meaning: "The moral of it all is this: We must go back to the old way of electing Senators and Congressmen. The fact that 68 of our 82 Senators are lawyers, many of them connected with banks, railroads and other corporations, and 42 of them being millionaires, also that a large portion of our Congressmen being connected with and interested in corporations which are being used to enrich the few to the detriment of the many, makes this absolutely necessary."

This paragraph makes us say that Senator Vance is an enemy to the people. That was another slip of the pen. We meant to say, and repeat it now, that Senator Vance has placed himself in the attitude of an enemy so far as the Sub-Treasury bill is concerned, and we are going to stick to it until convinced to the contrary, by Senator Vance or somebody else. But he would be a great fool who would say that Vance has always been an enemy of the people, or that his position on most other questions had been antagonistic to the interests of the people of his State.

We have endeavored to explain ourselves and injure no one. We have, we think, made it plain that we were defending our principles as Alliance men instead of making war on Senator Vance or the Democratic party. The Alliance is non-partisan. When it was first organized it wanted political reform. It wants it yet. But it will expect to get it through the dominant party. The majority rules in the Alliance. A majority of the Alliance men are Democrats, and notwithstanding the signs of disintegration which have been conjured up by some of the newspapers of the State, we have no fears. The Democrats in the Alliance will vote as they please. The Republicans in the Alliance will do the same. It is alleged that Alliance men have urged a third party. If true they have done it without the authority of the majority of Alliance men. Any Alliance man who intimates that there is a third party being formed does himself and the cause an injustice.

## THE ALLIANCE IS A PLATFORM MAKER.

THE *Charlotte Chronicle*, which is edited with marked ability, is like some more of us, it makes some bad mistakes. In a recent issue it has the following to say about the Alliance:

"The Alliance has gone into politics. The *Chronicle* does not think it wisest for the organization and its constitutional purposes, that it should have been led into politics by ambitious leaders. However, as a fact, the Alliance is now in politics. Properly it starts out with a platform; the principal feature of which is the sub-treasury scheme. When that idea was first given to the public, it was brought forth with a brass band and a long procession amidst great rejoicings, as the one remedy for the evils of agricultural depression. Its object is worthy the support of every patriot, and did the *Chronicle* believe that it were constitutional, and that it would remedy agricultural depression, no farmer in the entire country would give it heartier support than would this paper."

We noticed in one of our exchanges a day or two ago, a brief but concise

answer to the *Chronicle*. In substance it was about as follows: "The farmers are not very anxious to make platforms, but they are making earnest efforts to make some platform performers." That is it. The platforms are very good. But we need more "platform performers" very, very badly.

## SENATOR VANCE

Joins the Ranks of the Letter-Writers upon the Sub-Treasury Bill.

THE *National Economist*, of last week, contained the following comments on the letter written by Senator Vance concerning the Sub-Treasury bill. The *Economist* is published in Washington City, and if it does not state the case correctly Senator Vance can correct it:

The above letter will indeed be a surprise to the farmers of this country, and could with perfect safety be left to stand or fall on its merits. The membership have answered and completely demolished the sophistry and false arguments of Mills, Carlisle and the other letter writers who take the Wall-street view of the matter, and would no doubt in time will answer Senator Vance, but it is deemed best to here publish the letter in full and comment upon it fairly, and with neither favor or opposition to its author, call attention to the forces that he and others like him under present conditions are compelled to obey.

The *Economist* has no war to make on those who see fit to oppose the Sub-Treasury law; that is not its mission. It seeks to educate in the principles of economic government and contends for all the principles of the Alliance and such measures as have been adopted by the Supreme Council. Those who oppose the Sub-Treasury law will find their hands full in trying to make peace with a downtrodden and oppressed people that would be benefited by it. If they write letters in opposition to that measure they may expect answers. Sophistry may often sound so plausible that it can not be readily answered in debate, but when it is written it can be subjected to the inflexible laws of analysis, and always successfully combated.

The first paragraph of the above letter shows that it was not written in response to any inquiry from President Carr upon the subject, but to silence rumors in regard to the Senator's position and to answer numerous letters of inquiry. The Senator very properly concluded that the best way to answer all the letters that had come pouring in on him, and at the same time silence all rumors, was to address a letter to the President of the State Alliance of North Carolina and publish it for the benefit of all concerned. This is all right and proper, but it shows that Senator Vance had kept his views strictly to himself from the time the bill was introduced till the present, and it does not seem unfair to conclude that he remained silent just as long as he could, because a further silence could only have been constructed as an opposition to the measure without the "Sunday suit" in which he dresses his views in the letter. The Chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the Alliance recently addressed letters of inquiry on this subject to Senator Vance and Representative Pickler, the following are the replies received:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 26, 1890.  
DEAR SIR:—Your favor of 19th inst. came duly to hand. In reply I will say that I am now preparing a letter which will fully explain my position on the Sub-Treasury bill, and when it is ready I shall be pleased to furnish you with a copy.  
Very respectfully and truly yours,  
Z. B. VANCE

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 16, 1890.  
MY DEAR SIR:—Your favor of June 19th, stating that you are in receipt of information from several of the States in which it is stated I will probably vote against the Sub-Treasury bill, received. I have to say that there is no foundation in truth for such reports, and I shall not vote against the bill. The main objects of the bill as I understand it, to-wit: To procure more money for circulation, a flexible volume, at a low rate of interest and in the most direct manner, to the people, and to devise some means which will assist the producer in holding his products until such time during the year as will enable him to realize the greatest amount for such products, I heartily favor. It is, I think, probable that some amendment as to details are desirable, but the objects I cordially favor in the bill, or in any other reasonable form they may be presented, and I shall so vote.

J. R. PICKLER.  
This shows that Senator Vance kept the legislative committee as much in the dark in regard to his position as he did the rest of the order. Why was this? If he was under no obligation to support the measure, why resist all efforts to find out his position just so long as he possibly could? Answers to these questions will be developed as the statements of the letter are better understood.

The second paragraph of the letter shows that Senator Vance told President Polk and the Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Alliance that he was not prepared to support the bill, but that was not the bill he introduced. The bill introduced in the House by Mr. Pickler was the bill drawn up by the Legislative Commit-

tee, and is the only bill drawn by that committee. A copy of this bill had been presented to Senator Vance, and it was about it he was talking when he used the language he quotes. But he went further and proposed to remodel and amend the bill and put it in better shape before he introduced it. This was readily agreed to, and he was informed that it was believed that his greater wisdom and experience would make every change that he might propose an improvement. The Chairman of the Legislative Committee gave him special authority to make any changes in the bill that he might choose. He took the bill, made the changes without further consultation, and introduced it, and the first time the Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Alliance saw the Vance bill or knew what its provisions were was after it had been introduced in the Senate and printed. The Senate bill is the Vance modification of the Sub-Treasury bill, and the question naturally arises, if he could not amend the bill so that he would support it, why did he amend it at all? Again if he saw fit to amend it and introduce it in a shape that he would not support, why did he not say so, at least to the committee? Could he have been acting in good faith at the time he took the bill, amended it, and introduced the Vance bill if he then intended to write this letter at such time as was calculated to do the cause much harm? These and many others of like import are pertinent and will be answered in various ways by thinking people of this country.

In the third paragraph Senator Vance says: "I cannot support this bill in its present shape," and in the closing sentence of the letter he says: "Let us earnestly contend against the spirit of centralization which is constantly threatening to absorb the local self-government of the people of the States." Now since he is alone responsible for its "present shape," and since he inserted as one of his amendments to the bill the feature making the managers of the sub-treasures subject to appointment by the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of being subject to election by popular vote of the people of the country as provided in the genuine Sub-Treasury bill of the committee, and since that clause of the bill is the one that has raised opposition as a feature tending to centralization, "that would fill the States with carpet-baggers, Federal appointees, and colored supervisors," and since the Senator is a Southern man and a Democrat, is there not danger that some shrewd observer will put this and that together and say: "Vance is no fool; he don't make such blunders as that; he did it on purpose. He has acted as traitor and betrayed the farmers' movement. He could not honestly put in a feature that would tend to kill the measure with Democrats. He is, however, making himself ridiculous by throwing stones at the glass house he himself built." If there be any who would ask these questions, and no doubt there will be, they will do the Senator great injustice, and be altogether wrong. Those who know Senator Vance will never accuse him of the wrongs here implied. He has always been on the side of the farmer next after the Democratic party, and it is too late for him now to change. That his course has been wrong, and that it has perpetrated a great wrong upon the Alliance movement, cannot be denied; but that Senator Vance intended it should from the beginning, or now intends it, or has in any way intended any bad faith with the Order, is denied most positively. In fact there is abundant evidence for the belief that he, when he had amended the bill to his liking and introduced it, intended to support and vote for the bill. His proverbial honesty would have impelled him to notify the committee had he intended to do otherwise. There can be no doubt that he intended to support and vote for the bill until recently. Then when he found himself forced to change, it became necessary to write a big letter in order to neutralize this appearance of a deliberate design to injure the Order from the start. Senator Vance is a pure man, and a true man as true goes in these modern times—true to party first and to the people next.

The place in which the sincerity of Senator Vance seems most questionable is where he claims the Sub-Treasury bill to be unconstitutional, because it "provides for the loaning of money to the people by the government." He knows that it is constitutional for the government to accept a deposit having exchangeable value (bonds) and issue to certain corporations treasury notes, and charge them a tax of one per cent. per annum, because the Supreme Court of the United States has said it was constitutional, and that settles the point beyond question. Yet he claims that it is unconstitutional for the government to accept a deposit having exchangeable (and intrinsic) value from anybody, and issue treasury notes to them and charge an interest of one per cent. per annum. Now the question is, if he is sincere in this belief, why did he not in his bill change the word interest to tax, and have an exact counterpart to the national bank law that has been declared constitutional?

[CONTINUED ON SIXTH PAGE.]